

## REMARKS

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim states that is "Currently Amended" when it is not currently amended and should be "Previously Presented." Claims should be provided with the proper status identifier. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant has amended the claim accordingly.

Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation of "the interactive sign comprising a bonusing event" is not clearly defined in the specification. The specification appears to describe the interactive sign comprising a LCD screen. The specification also appears to describe the LCD screen of the interactive display displaying a bonusing event that the players can enter in. However, the specification appears to be silent with regards to the interactive sign comprising a bonusing event.

Applicant has amended the claims accordingly.

The specification does appear to state that a bonusing event is a wheel or an LCD screen (or interactive sign) that a player plays on (see pg. 10, lines 22-23) and not the act of a player playing on a wheel or LCD screen for a bonus. This appears to make sense in terms of the present limitation of the claim. But,

this interpretation from page 10 confuses the limitation of "wherein players...who enter said bonusing event compete against each other on said interactive sign," because the term "bonusing event" as used in this limitation clearly indicates that players are entering a contest or game state that plays out on an interactive sign, and not having players enter a physical structure such as a wheel or LCD screen. Therefore, this portion of the specification does not provide sufficient support for the claim as written.

Applicant has amended the claim accordingly.

Meanwhile, on page 13, lines 2-3, the specification states that the interactive sign, which is an LCD screen, is where the player plays the Casino Dealer in a bonusing event. Furthermore, page 13, lines 11-22 outlines the circumstances under which a player would be allowed to play a bonus event. A "bonusing event" as described on page 13, uses the term as a contest or game state that plays out on a structure, and is not a structure like an LCD screen or wheel. The use of the term "bonusing event" as used on page 13, would suggest the claim being written as an "interactive sign that executes a bonusing event" and not as an "interactive sign comprising a bonusing event."

Therefore, neither usage of the term "bonusing event" provides a sufficient description to clearly define the claim. In light of how the specification uses the term "bonusing event", the claims contains subject matter which was not written in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended the claim accordingly.

Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As stated in the Office action of 5/6/2005, the limitation of claim 13 or "wherein players playing said linked gaming machines who enter said bonusing event compete against each other on said interactive sign" is non-enabled nor adequately described by the specification. The specification describes that it is an object or goal of the invention to allow players to compete an interactive sign at a bonusing event (page 10, lines 22-23), but is silent as to how the players compete against each other. The specification states that it was an "object" of the present invention to perform these functions and vaguely describes a board game embodiment of the interactive sign, but does not appear to describe how the invention achieves this goal, how players would be competing against each other, or how the rules associated with the competition. The specification appears to be enabling only of a competition between a player on the gaming machine and a Casino Dealer who is displayed on the interactive sign. Therefore, it also appears as though the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in

such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the invention was filed, had possession of the claimed invention of a system with an interactive sign on which players on linked gaming machines enter in a bonusing event competing against each other.

Support for all of the claims can be found on pages 9-14 and the figures.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 22 states the limitation of a competition "between a player playing said gaming machine and said interactive sign."

Again, the specification appears to be silent as to how a player competes against the interactive sign. The specification describes the player entering in a bonusing event where the player plays one on one with the Casino Dealer and the competition is displayed on the interactive sign. However, the claim does not state that the player is playing against a Casino Dealer via an interactive sign, but instead states that the player is playing against the interactive sign. Again, the specification appears to be enabling only of a competition between a player on the gaming machine and a Casino Dealer who is displayed on the interactive sign. Therefore, it also appears as though the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the

invention was filed, had possession of the claimed invention of a system with an interactive sign where a player enters bonus play and competes against the interactive sign.

Applicant has amended the claim accordingly.

Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 22 states the limitation of "competition is between a player playing said gaming machine and said interactive sign" while claim 13 states that the competition is between players entered in a bonusing event. The scope of the claim is therefore unclear, as it appears to claim functionality of the system beyond the system defined in claim 13 by allowing players to compete against the interactive sign instead of only against other players entered in the bonusing event.

Applicant has amended the claims accordingly.

As best understood, claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cannon'923 (US 2002/0039923). Cannon'923 teaches a gaming system wherein at least two gaming machines are linked together (see proximate lead lines 100 and Figs. 5 and 4) and to an interactive sign (see proximate lead line 102 and pars. 6 and 83), the interactive sign displays a bonusing event (see pars. 45-47) and is operated by a central controller which operates the bonusing event (see proximate lead line 302), and the players playing on the gaming machines who enter in the bonusing event compete

against each other in the form of a tournament (see pars. 45-47, 49-51, and 77). Cannon'923 also teaches the interactive sign being an LCD screen (see pars. 6 and 83), and the competition is displayed on the interactive sign, thereby allowing the player to be competing against the interactive sign and the information displayed on the sign (see pars. 45-47, 49-51, and 77).

Amended claim 13 requires that the interactive sign comprise an LCD screen, wherein the LCD screen display a bonusing event that players can enter in. These players compete against each other on said interactive sign. Cannon does not teach that the LCD screen display a bonusing event, and does not teach that players compete against each other in the bonusing event. For this reason claims 13 and 22 are not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Claim 23 depends on claim 13 and requires a system for alerting a player when they are playing on said interactive sign. Cannon does not teach this. For this reason and the reasons stated above for claim 13, claim 23 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Claim 24 depends on claim 13 and requires that a player operates the bonusing event from any of the gaming machines linked to the interactive sign. For the reasons stated above for claim 13, claim 24 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Claim 25 depends on claim 13 and requires that the bonusing event comprises a wheel which has various monetary denominations. Cannon does not

teach this. For this reason and the reasons stated above, claim 25 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Claim 26 depends on claim 13 and requires that the bonusing event is an LCD screen which allows a player to play one on one with a casino dealer on the LCD screen. Cannon does not teach this. For this reason and the reasons stated above for claim 13, claim 26 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Claim 27 depends on claim 13 and requires that the bonusing event comprises a ferris wheel that unloads coins when one of the linked gaming machines triggers the bonusing event. Cannon does not teach this. For this reason and the reasons stated above for claim 13, claim 27 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.


Claim 28 depends on claim 13 and requires a video monitor located on the gaming machine to produce pictures on the interactive sign. Cannon does not teach this. For this reason and the reasons stated above for claim 13, claim 27 is not anticipated or obvious over Cannon.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 882413541 US  
Date of Deposit: August 22, 2006  
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail  
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
August 22, 2006

Signature:   
Name: Maureen P. Herbst

Respectfully submitted,

  
Philip M. Weiss  
Reg. No. 34,751  
Attorney for Applicant  
Weiss & Weiss  
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251  
Mineola, NY 11501  
(516) 739-1500